

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

Serial No. 09/863,078
December 10, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003
Page 6 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. The Examiner has withdrawn claims 4-7 and 14-17.

Claims 1-3, 8-13, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) of Figure 5 in view of Wright (U.S. 3,548,356). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-13, and 18-20.

Claim 1 recites:

"A transformer comprising:
a bobbin having first and second tube-shaped members which are coaxial and integral with one another, said first tube-shaped member being located radially within said second tube-shaped member so as to form a gap located therebetween, and **said first and second tube-shaped members being integral with and attached to a common base member;**
a first winding comprising an air-core coil located in said gap between said first and second tube-shaped members of said bobbin; and
a second winding affixed to said second tube-shaped member of said bobbin." (emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 1 recites the feature of "said first and second tube-shaped members being integral with and attached to a common base member." Applicants' claim 11 recites features which are similar to features recited in Applicants' claim 1, including the above emphasized features. With the improved features of claims 1 and 11, Applicants have been able to provide a transformer which has improved coupling, is reduced in size, has a tolerance for high voltages, and is reduced in cost (see, for example, the last paragraph on page 7 of the originally filed Specification).

The Examiner alleged in the first full paragraph on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action that it would have been obvious to make the first and second tube-shaped members integral with the common base member because "it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put

Serial No. 09/863,078
December 10, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003
Page 7 of 9

together involves only routine experimentation. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893)."

First, Applicants' claimed invention does not include merely forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces. The structure and arrangement of elements recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 11 are completely different from that shown in Applicants' Fig. 5. Particularly, the first and second tube-shaped members of the present invention are integral with and attached to a common base member to provide a gap therebetween to accommodate an air-core coil. The transformer of AAPA as shown in Applicants' Fig. 5 does **NOT** include any gap or air-core coil. In contrast, as clearly seen in Applicants' Fig. 5 coil 12 is formed by winding a wire around the tube-shaped member 11, and thus, certainly cannot be fairly construed as an air-core coil as recited in the present claimed invention.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Applicants' claimed invention does **not** merely include forming into one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces. Applicants' invention must be considered "as a whole". Medtronic, Inc., v. Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc., 721 F.2d 1563, 220 USPQ 97, 99-100 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Rather than considering the invention "as a whole," the Examiner has improperly reduced Applicants' claimed invention to the "idea" of forming into one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces. Reducing a claimed invention to an "idea" and then determining patentability of that "idea" is error. Jones v. Hardy, 727 F.2d 1524, 1528, 220 USPQ 1021, 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Second, assuming *arguendo* that the only difference between the prior art and Applicants' claimed invention is forming into one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces, *Pyle Nat. Co. v. Lewin*, 92 F.2d 628 (7th Cir. 1937) states:

Appellants also advance the proposition that the mere casting together of two or more parts, which previously had been cast separately, does not constitute invention, and a number of cases are cited in support of this contention, chief of which is *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164, 14 S. Ct. 68, 37 L. Ed. 1039. This proposition, however, must

Serial No. 09/863,078
December 10, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003
Page 8 of 9

be limited to cases where by such a change no new or different result is attained. (emphasis added)

Applicants have provided a copy of *Pyle* herewith for the Examiner's convenience. That is, making two parts integral has only been held to be obvious in the situations where doing so would result in no new or different result.

As noted above, Applicants clearly state in the last full paragraph on page 7 of the originally filed Specification that they have been able to provide a transformer which has improved coupling, reduced in size, tolerance for high voltages, and reduced in cost. That is, Applicants have been able to provide a transformer with improved (different) results.

Thus, Applicants' claimed invention is not obvious in view of the prior art because Applicants' claimed invention achieves improved results.

Wright was relied upon to allegedly teach an air-core coil. Wright certainly fails to teach or suggest "said first and second tube-shaped members being integral with and attached to a common base member" as recited in the present claimed invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Wright fails to cure the deficiencies of AAPA described above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-13, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) of Figure 5 in view of Wright (U.S. 3,548,356).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that AAPA and Wright, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claims 1 and 11 of the present application. Elected claims 2, 3, 8-10, 12, 13 and 18-20 depend upon claims 1 and 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

In addition, since claims 1 and 11 are generic, Applicants respectfully submit that non-elected claims 4-7 and 14-17 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1

Serial No. 09/863,078
December 10, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003
Page 9 of 9

and 11 are allowance, and must be rejoined and allowed accordingly.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a TWO-month extension of time, extending to December 15, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 10, 2003


Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080